

## S.0 SUMMARY

### S.1 Project Synopsis

The existing Salvation Army Divisional Camp and Retreat is owned and operated by the Salvation Army, a community-oriented non-profit organization. The current facility has functioned as a camp and retreat center for several decades under the original County Major Use Permit (MUP) P70-379 and modification P70-379W.

The 578-acre project site is located in the southwestern portion of the Ramona Community Planning Area south of State Route 67 (SR-67) and north of the San Vicente Reservoir in San Diego County, California. Specifically, the site is located at 14488 Mussey Grade Road. The project site is primarily mountainous, with steep slopes on the western portion of the site. Currently, there are several hiking trails, a mounted cross and one remote camping site in the steeper portions of the site. A small portion of the site consists of a meadow and gently rolling hills. The southeastern portion of the site contains relatively level, disturbed land where the existing camping facility has been developed. The existing camping facility generally includes: a pool with restroom and showers, ranch house, cabins, retreat building, overnight remote camping location, maintenance area, and 10,000 gallon water tank.

The current camp and retreat facilities are insufficient for existing activities. The limited size, program, and facilities preclude provision of the level of service the Salvation Army seeks to provide with this camp. In summary, the Salvation Army's main objective is to improve the existing camp to serve the needs of the community and youth of the San Diego Region. Under the Applicant's Preferred Project, the maximum camp capacity at full build-out would be 748 persons. Under Reduced Project Alternative I, the maximum camp capacity at full build-out would be 615 persons. ~~with a capacity of approximately 748 users while maintaining the predominantly rural character of the site.~~ This would be accomplished with a comprehensive plan for logical development that is sensitive to the existing environment, and provides habitat protection consistent with the existing surroundings. Specifically, the proposed project will include the following major components:

- Expanded Cabin Camping Component
- Expanded and Relocated Tent Camping Component (This feature is eliminated under Reduced Project Alternative I)
- Nature Study/Educational Camp Component (This feature is reduced under Reduced Project Alternative I)
- Expanded and Relocated Conference and Retreat Center (Retreat) (This feature is reduced under Reduced Project Alternative I)
- Additional Staff Housing
- Expanded Support Facilities. The proposed project would include the following expanded support facilities:

- An approximately 21,000 square-foot central dining facility with a capacity of approximately ~~600-users~~ persons.
- An approximately 19,500 square-foot multi-purpose building with a capacity of approximately ~~600-users~~ persons.
- An approximately 2,500 square-foot indoor mini-theater building with a capacity of approximately ~~125-users~~ persons.
- A central administrative cluster of buildings with a combined maximum square footage of approximately 6,000 square feet to serve the entire camp. The administrative offices, a small infirmary, and a small convenience store “canteen” for employees and users of the camp.
- The existing maintenance facilities would be demolished and relocated to the central part of the property along the eastern boundary.
- New sports and play areas including tennis courts, basketball courts, a large swimming pool and an approximately 2,500-square-foot restroom and shower facility.
- A standard septic system and leach fields throughout the site.
- Parking to support the maximum population of 748 persons on-site approximately (188 designated spaces; 112 overflow spaces).
- A ~~260,000-gallon~~ 650,000-gallon bolted steel water tank (expandable to 800,000 gallons) ~~bolted steel water tank~~, approximately ~~60~~ 70 feet ~~wide~~ in diameter and ~~43~~ 23 feet high.
- A recreational rope course consisting of two 40-foot ladders connected by rope, and a 300-foot zip line for recreational purposes.
- Continued use of outdoor ball fields for band practice until such time that the multi-purpose facility is available for such practice.

## S.2 Summary of Significant Effects and Mitigation Measures that Reduce the Significant Effects

The proposed project would result in significant direct impacts to Geology/Soils, Biological Resources, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Noise, Aesthetics, Cultural Resources, Land Use/Planning, and cumulative transportation/traffic. Table S-1 describes each significant environmental effect, proposed mitigation measures, and impact significance with mitigation. With the exception of Biological Resources and Land Use/Planning, all direct and cumulative impacts will be mitigated to a level below significant. The Reduced Project Alternative I would avoid the unmitigated impacts to Biological Resources and Land Use/Planning associated with the Applicant's Preferred Project (748 persons).

## S.3 Project Alternatives

Chapter 4 includes an analysis of the project alternatives. Four alternatives were considered but rejected without detailed analysis: 1) No Development Alternative; 2) Off-site Alternative; 3) Camp Component Relocation Alternative; and, 4) Residential Development Alternative. These alternatives were rejected

because they either did not meet the project objectives or are infeasible pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15126.6[c] and [f][1]. Three project alternatives were carried forward for further consideration: 1) Reduced Project Alternative II; 2) Reduced Project Alternative I; and 3) No Project Alternative. As an outcome of environmental review and analysis, unmitigated impacts were identified for the Applicant's Preferred Project (748 persons). Due to conflicts with the BMO, the Applicant's Preferred Alternative can not be approved; therefore, Reduced Project Alternative I (615 persons) is being carried forward to the decision makers for consideration. However, for fire protection purposes, the multi-purpose building would remain at 19,500 square feet, as is currently proposed under the Applicant's Preferred Project.

## Reduced Project Alternative II

The Reduced Project Alternative II, discussed in detail in Section 4.4, would reduce the Education Camp ~~and Multi-Purpose Building~~. This alternative would reduce the retreat component and eliminate the yurt camp and a presentation area, and would reduce the education camp component. As a result, this alternative would decrease the project footprint by ~~39,900~~ 30,900 square feet and the overnight camp capacity by 235 ~~users~~ persons when compared with the proposed project.

Reduced Project Alternative II would reduce or avoid project-related significant impacts to a greater extent than either the proposed project or Reduced Project Alternative I while meeting most of the project objectives. The significant and unmitigated impacts related to conflicts with the MSCP (Biological Resource impact) and the General Plan Conservation Element (Land Use/Planning impact) that would occur with implementation of the proposed project would not occur under the Reduced Project Alternative II. However, significant and mitigable impacts would still occur under this alternative and require implementation of relatively the same mitigation measures identified for the proposed project in order to reduce them to below significant levels. Therefore, it is identified as the environmentally superior alternative pursuant to Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines.

The Reduced Project Alternative II would meet most of the project objectives; however, locating the Retreat Center in close proximity to the remaining camp facilities conflicts with project objective number 4 (EIR Section 1.2). The location of the Retreat Center under Reduced Project Alternative II conflicts with the purpose of the Salvation Army's goal to promote personal growth in a physically distinct and isolated setting. The reductions would conflict with Salvation Army's goal to adequately serve the needs of the community. Therefore, the Reduced Project Alternative II was rejected by the Salvation Army.

## Reduced Project Alternative I

The Reduced Project Alternative I, discussed in detail in Section 4.3, would also reduce the Education Camp ~~and Multi-Purpose Building~~. Similarly, this alternative would also reduce the retreat component and eliminate the yurt camp and a presentation area. Implementation of this alternative would result in project footprint ~~building~~ reduction by 11,150 square feet with an overall camp capacity reduction of 133 ~~users~~ persons when compared to the proposed project.

The Reduced Project Alternative I would reduce or avoid project-related significant impacts to a greater extent than the proposed project while meeting all but one project objectives. As with the Reduced Project Alternative II, locating the Retreat Center in close proximity to the remaining camp facilities

conflicts with project objective number 4 (EIR Section 1.2). Similarly, the Reduced Project Alternative I was rejected by the Salvation Army. The significant and unmitigated impacts related to conflicts with the MSCP (Biological Resource) and the General Plan Conservation Element (Land Use) that would occur with implementation of the proposed project would not occur under the Reduced Project Alternative I. However, significant and mitigable impacts would still occur under this alternative and require implementation of relatively the same mitigation measures identified for the proposed project in order to reduce them to below significant levels.

The No Project Alternative, discussed in detail in Section 4.2, would not attain the basic objective of the Salvation Army, which is to implement a master plan of improvements for the existing Salvation Army Camp and Retreat in order to serve the community and youth of the San Diego region. As it currently exists, the Sierra Del Mar Divisional Camp and Retreat does not provide adequate capacity or the facilities to function as a campground for the community. The No Project Alternative does not meet any of the project objectives. Therefore, the No Project Alternative was rejected by the Salvation Army.

## S.4 Areas of Controversy

The CEQA Guidelines §15123 (b)(2) requires that areas of controversy known to the lead agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public, be identified in the Summary. Issues raised in response to the Notice of Preparation prepared for the EIR include fire safety; population density; community character; traffic; infrastructure improvement costs; noise and biological resources issues.

Issues of fire safety were raised by community residents due to the high fire hazard conditions in the area and the increased fire hazards associated with increasing area population and associated demand for resident evacuation in the event of a fire. Concerns raised regarding population density were related to the increase in camp capacity and changes to the area's rural nature, namely adverse effects on rural lifestyle and property value. Traffic was another concern due to the increasing traffic volumes on Mussey Grade Road. Infrastructure improvement cost issues were raised by several residents with regard to payment for infrastructure costs and whether, as a non-profit organization, the Salvation Army would be responsible for fair share contributions to such improvements or whether such costs would be borne by the taxpayer.

Noise issues were raised in relation to increasing the use of the camp and subsequent increased noise levels in the area. In addition, impacts to the area's biological resources, including the nesting golden eagles to the west of the project site, have been a concern due to potential impacts to sensitive natural resources of the area.

## S.5 Issues to be Resolved by the Decision-Making Body

Based on all information included in the Record of Proceedings, the Board of Supervisors must decide whether or not the EIR was prepared in compliance with CEQA (Public Resources Code 21000, et. seq.) and Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA (California Code of Regulations Section 15000, et. seq.). If deemed compliant with CEQA, the Board of Supervisors ~~shall~~ may certify the EIR and consider whether to approve the proposed project or one of the project alternatives. As discussed in the Introduction to this

Final EIR, because there are alternatives to the Applicant's Preferred Project (748 persons) that can avoid the unmitigated impacts associated with conflicts with the MSCP (Biological Resources) and the General Plan Conservation Element (Land Use), Reduced Project Alternative I (615 persons) is the project that will be carried forward to the decision makers for consideration. Furthermore, the Board must decide if the proposed mitigation is adequate and choose whether or how to mitigate any significant impacts.

**TABLE S-1**  
**Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impact(s)	Recommended Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance of Impact(s) After Mitigation
<b>Section 2.1 – Geology/Soils</b>		
<p><b>Impact 2.1.a</b>  Significant seismic hazards associated with ground shaking, landsliding, and rock sliding during seismic events.</p>	<p><b>MM 2.1.a</b>  The applicant shall prepare site-specific geotechnical studies, including a comprehensive soil evaluation, prior to approval of the grading plans and issuance of building permits for each development application under the proposed project. The geotechnical studies shall include specific mitigation requirements as appropriate to each development proposal that reduce seismically-related impacts to below a level of significance, and may include the following measures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In areas of proposed development, landslides, rockslides, improperly compacted fill soil, and highly erosive soils will require special attention. Buttresses, stabilizing fill material, or other methods of stabilization shall be required in developed areas where landslides and rockslides are encountered. In areas where landslides and rockslide exist off-site, and where stabilization is not feasible, setbacks shall be required.</li> <li>• For the purpose of preliminary design, cut and fill slopes shall be designed no steeper than 2:1. The shear strengths of existing soil and rock will generally limit safe allowable slope height. The potential impact of geologic conditions on slope stability shall be evaluated in areas of proposed cut slopes greater than 15 feet in height.</li> <li>• Proper surface drainage shall be provided and maintained, as it is essential to soil stability and to reduce the potential for erosion. Drainage swales shall be installed on graded pads to conduct storm or irrigation runoff to controlled drainage facilities, and away from buildings and the tops of slopes. These measures shall be taken during construction to ensure that storm and irrigation water does not flow over the tops of cut or fill slopes.</li> </ul> <p>The Salvation Army will implement each measure recommended in the Geotechnical Studies, as required and approved by the County, to ensure seismically-related impacts are reduced to below a level of significance.</p>	<p>Not Significant.</p>

Impact(s)	Recommended Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance of Impact(s) After Mitigation
<b>Section 2.1 – Geology/Soils (continued)</b>		
<p><b>Impact 2.1.b</b></p> <p>Significant impacts due to unprotected erodible soils and altered drainage patterns.</p>	<p><b>MM 2.2.b</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prior to approval of a grading permit, the applicant shall prepare a grading/construction management plan. This plan shall include the recommendations outlined in a report prepared by a geotechnical engineer regarding all cut and fill slopes and foundation work.</li> </ul> <p>The grading/construction management plan shall also include the recommendations outlined in a report prepared by a landscape architect regarding the revegetation of graded slopes to ensure proper revegetation. The landscape architect shall pay particular attention to areas that have been stripped of native vegetation or areas of fill material and recommend appropriate erosion control measures. These areas may require desilting basins, improved surface drainage or planting of ground covers early in the improvement process, to reduce the potential for erosion.</p> <p>Short-term measures for controlling erosion shall be incorporated into grading plans on-site, as outlined in the Geotechnical studies approved by the County's Department of Public Works. These measures may include sandbag placement and temporary detention basins.</p> <p>The Salvation Army will implement each measure included in the grading/construction management plan, as approved and required by the County, to reduce impacts associated with soil erosion to below a level of significance.</p>	<p>Not Significant.</p>
<b>Section 2.2 - Biological Resources</b>		
<p><b>Impact 2.2.a</b></p> <p>Significant biological impacts to 2.00 acres of Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest. (<u>Reduced Project Alternative I impact is 1.36 acres of Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest.</u>)</p> <p><b>Impact 2.2.b</b></p> <p>Significant biological impacts to 7.29 acres of Coast Live Oak Woodlands. (<u>Reduced Project Alternative I impact is 7.96 acres of Coast Live Oak Woodlands.</u>)</p>	<p><b>MM 2.2.a &amp; b</b></p> <p>Within the proposed dedicated open space easement, 18.89 acres of oak woodland (15.05 acres Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest, and 3.84 acres Coast Live Oak Woodland) shall be preserved.</p> <p><u><b>Reduced Project Alternative I Mitigation:</b></u>  <u>Within the proposed dedicated open space easement, 29.35 acres of oak woodland (25.67 acres Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest, and 3.68 acres Coast Live Oak Woodland) shall be preserved.</u></p>	<p>Not Significant.</p>

Impact(s)	Recommended Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance of Impact(s) After Mitigation
<p><b>Impact 2.2.c</b> Significant biological impacts to 0.17 acre of ACOE Non-wetland Waters of the U.S. that are County-jurisdictional (RPO) wetlands. (<u>Reduced Project Alternative I impact is 0.03 acre of RPO wetlands.</u>)</p>	<p><b>MM 2.2.c</b> Within the proposed dedicated open space easement in the northern portion of the site within the Non-Native Grassland habitat adjacent to riparian areas associated with the West Fork of the San Vicente Creek, 0.39 acre of wetland habitat shall be created in accordance with a wetland restoration plan approved by the County.</p> <p><b><u>Reduced Project Alternative I Mitigation:</u></b> <u>Within the proposed dedicated open space easement in the northern portion of the site within the Non-Native Grassland habitat adjacent to riparian areas associated with the West Fork of the San Vicente Creek, 0.39 acre of wetland habitat shall be created in accordance with a wetland restoration plan approved by the County.</u></p>	Not Significant.
<p><b>Impact 2.2.d</b> Significant biological impacts to 13.12 acres of Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub. (<u>Reduced Project Alternative I impact is 12.29 acres of Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub.</u>)</p> <p><b>Impact 2.2.e</b> Significant biological impacts to 9.26 acres of Coastal Sage-Chaparral Scrub. (<u>Reduced Project Alternative I impact is 8.18 acres of Coastal Sage Chaparral Scrub.</u>)</p>	<p><b>MM 2.2.d &amp; e</b> Within the proposed dedicated open space easement 35.36 acres of sage scrub (6.46 acres of Mafic Southern Mixed Chaparral [a Tier I habitat], 0.05 acre of Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub, and 28.85 acres of Coastal Sage-Chaparral Scrub) shall be preserved.</p> <p><b><u>Reduced Project Alternative I Mitigation:</u></b> <u>Within the proposed dedicated open space easement 41.58 acres of sage scrub, 6.42 acres of Mafic Southern Mixed Chaparral [a Tier I habitat], 4.65 acres of Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub, and 30.51 acres of Coastal Sage-Chaparral Scrub) shall be preserved.</u></p>	Not Significant.
<p><b>Impact 2.2.f</b> Significant biological impacts to 37.36 acres of Southern Mixed Chaparral. (<u>Reduced Project Alternative I impact is 36.73 acres of Southern Mixed Chaparral.</u>)</p> <p><b>Impact 2.2.g</b> Significant biological impacts to 12.45 acres of Non-native Grasslands. (<u>Reduced Project Alternative I impact is 12.41 acres of Non-native Grasslands.</u>)</p>	<p><b>MM 2.2.f &amp; g</b> Within the proposed dedicated open space easement, 223.42 acres of Tier III habitat (223.19 acres of Southern Mixed Chaparral and 0.23 acre of Non-native Grassland) shall be preserved.</p> <p><b><u>Reduced Project Alternative I Mitigation:</u></b> <u>Within the proposed dedicated open space easement, 319.21 acres of Tier III habitat (318.40 acres of Southern Mixed Chaparral and 0.81 acre of Non-native Grassland) shall be preserved.</u></p>	Not Significant.



Impact(s)	Recommended Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance of Impact(s) After Mitigation
<b>Impact 2.2.h</b> Significant direct and indirect biological impacts to 38 Engelmann Oaks. <u>(Reduced Project Alternative I impact is 32 Engelmann Oaks.)</u>	<b>MM 2.2.h</b> Engelmann Oaks (Group D) shall be preserved through on-site preservation of oak woodlands in the proposed dedicated open space easement.  <b><u>Reduced Project Alternative I Mitigation:</u></b> <u>Engelmann Oaks (Group D) shall be preserved through on-site preservation of oak woodlands in the proposed dedicated open space easement.</u>	Not Significant.
<b>Impact 2.2.i</b> Significant indirect biological impacts to the California Gnatcatcher.	<b>MM 2.2.i</b> Construction activities shall be prohibited during the California gnatcatcher breeding season (March 1 – August 15) unless nest monitoring is conducted by a qualified biologist and results indicated the absence of active nests or the completion of the breeding season.	Not Significant.
<b>Impact 2.2.j</b> Significant indirect biological impacts to nesting raptors within <del>300</del> <u>500</u> feet of the construction footprint, if construction were to occur between February 15 and June 1.	<b>MM 2.2.j</b> Prior to construction within 500 feet of potential raptor nesting habitat (i.e., riparian or woodland habitat) to be conducted during the raptor breeding season (January 15 through July 15), the area within 500 feet of the construction footprint shall be surveyed for the presence of nesting raptors. If active nests are present, construction within 500 feet of the active nest will be delayed until the nest is abandoned. <u>To avoid any direct and indirect impacts to raptors and/or any migratory birds, grubbing and clearing of vegetation that may support active nests and construction activities adjacent to nesting habitat, should occur outside of the breeding season (January 15 to August 15). If removal of habitat and/or construction activities is necessary adjacent to nesting habitat during the breeding season, the applicant shall retain a County-approved biologist to conduct a pre-construction survey to determine the presence of non-listed nesting migratory birds on or within 100-feet of the construction area, Federally- or State-listed birds (e.g., coastal California gnatcatcher, least Bell's Vireo) on or within 300-feet of the construction area and nesting raptors within 500-feet of the construction area. The preconstruction survey must be conducted within 10 calendar days prior to the start of construction. The results of the survey must be submitted to the County for review and approval prior to initiating any construction activities. If nesting birds are detected by the County-approved biologist, the following buffers should be established: 1) no work within 100 feet of a non-listed nesting migratory bird nest, 2) no work within 300 feet of a listed bird nest, and 3) no work within 500 feet of a raptor nest. However, the County may</u>	Not Significant.

Impact(s)	Recommended Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance of Impact(s) After Mitigation
	<p><u>reduce these buffer widths depending on site-specific conditions (e.g., the width and type of screening vegetation between the nest and proposed activity) or the existing ambient level of activity (e.g., existing level of human activity within the buffer distance). If construction must take place within the recommended buffer widths above, the project applicant should contact the County to determine the appropriate buffer.</u></p> <p><u>A bio-monitor shall be present on-site during all initial grubbing and clearing of vegetation to ensure that perimeter construction fencing is being maintained and to minimize the likelihood that nests containing eggs or chicks are abandoned or fails due to construction activity. A bio-monitor shall also perform periodic inspections of the construction site during all major grading to ensure that impacts to sensitive plants and wildlife are minimized. These inspections should take place once or twice a week, as defined by the County, depending on the sensitivity of the resources. The bio-monitor shall send weekly reports to the County and shall notify both the County and the Department immediately if clearing is done outside of the permitted project footprint.</u></p> <p><b>Reduced Project Alternative I Mitigation:</b>  <u>Construction activities shall be prohibited during the California gnatcatcher breeding season (March 1 - August 15) unless nest monitoring is conducted by a qualified biologist and results indicated the absence of active nests or the completion of the breeding season.</u></p> <p><u>Prior to construction within 500 feet of potential raptor nesting habitat (i.e., riparian or woodland habitat) to be conducted during the raptor breeding season (January 15 through July 15), the area within 500 feet of the construction footprint shall be surveyed for the presence of nesting raptors. If active nests are present, construction within 500 feet of the active nest will be delayed until the nest is abandoned.</u></p> <p><u>To avoid any direct and indirect impacts to raptors and/or any migratory birds, grubbing and clearing of vegetation that may support active nests and construction activities adjacent to nesting habitat, should occur outside of the breeding season (January 15 to August 15). If removal of habitat and/or construction activities is necessary adjacent to nesting habitat during the</u></p>	

Impact(s)	Recommended Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance of Impact(s) After Mitigation
	<p><u>breeding season, the applicant shall retain a County-approved biologist to conduct a pre-construction survey to determine the presence of non-listed nesting migratory birds on or within 100-feet of the construction area, Federally- or State-listed birds (e.g., coastal California gnatcatcher, least Bell's Vireo) on or within 300-feet of the construction area and nesting raptors within 500-feet of the construction area. The preconstruction survey must be conducted within 10 calendar days prior to the start of construction. The results of the survey must be submitted to the County for review and approval prior to initiating any construction activities. If nesting birds are detected by the County-approved biologist, the following buffers should be established: 1) no work within 100 feet of a non-listed nesting migratory bird nest, 2) no work within 300 feet of a listed bird nest, and 3) no work within 500 feet of a raptor nest. However, the County may reduce these buffer widths depending on site-specific conditions (e.g., the width and type of screening vegetation between the nest and proposed activity) or the existing ambient level of activity (e.g., existing level of human activity within the buffer distance). If construction must take place within the recommended buffer widths above, the project applicant should contact the County to determine the appropriate buffer.</u></p> <p><u>A bio-monitor shall be present on-site during all initial grubbing and clearing of vegetation to ensure that perimeter construction fencing is being maintained and to minimize the likelihood that nests containing eggs or chicks are abandoned or fails due to construction activity. A bio-monitor shall also perform periodic inspections of the construction site during all major grading to ensure that impacts to sensitive plants and wildlife are minimized. These inspections should take place once or twice a week, as defined by the County, depending on the sensitivity of the resources. The bio-monitor shall send weekly reports to the County and shall notify both the County and the Department immediately if clearing is done outside of the permitted project footprint.</u></p>	
<p><b>Impact 2.2.K</b> Significant conflict with the MSCP Subarea Plan Conformance Findings regarding edge effects. <u>(Note: This impact is avoided under Reduced Project Alternative I.)</u></p>	<p><b>MM 2.2.k</b> No mitigation proposed.</p>	

Impact(s)	Recommended Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance of Impact(s) After Mitigation
<p><b>Impact 2.2.l</b> Significant conflict with the BMO requirement that wetland impacts in BRCAs be avoided to the maximum extent practicable by using design criteria that include locating development in areas that minimize impacts to habitat. <u>(Note: This impact is avoided under Reduced Project Alternative I.)</u></p> <p><b>Impact 2.2.m</b> Significant conflict with the BMO requirement that Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub and Coastal Sage-Chaparral Scrub impacts in BRCAs to be avoided to the maximum extent practicable by using design criteria that include locating development in areas that minimize impacts to habitat. <u>(Note: This impact is avoided under Reduced Project Alternative I.)</u></p>	<p><b>MM 2.2.l</b> No mitigation proposed.</p> <p><b>MM 2.2.m</b> No mitigation proposed.</p>	<p>Significant and Umitigable. <u>(Note: This impact is avoided under Reduced Project Alternative I.)</u></p> <p>Significant and Umitigable. <u>(Note: This impact is avoided under Reduced Project Alternative I.)</u></p>
<p><b>Impact 2.2.n</b> Significant conflict with BMO design criteria for corridors. <u>(Note: This impact is avoided under Reduced Project Alternative I.)</u></p>	<p><b>MM 2.2.n</b> No mitigation proposed.</p>	<p>Significant and Umitigable. <u>(Note: This impact is avoided under Reduced Project Alternative I.)</u></p>
<p><b>Impact 2.2.o</b> Significant conflict with the RPO regarding protection of sensitive habitats (corridor). <u>(Note: This impact is avoided under Reduced Project Alternative I.)</u></p>	<p><b>MM 2.2.o</b> No mitigation proposed.</p>	<p>Significant and Umitigable. <u>(Note: This impact is avoided under Reduced Project Alternative I.)</u></p>

Impact(s)	Recommended Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance of Impact(s) After Mitigation
<b>Impact 2.2.p</b> Significant conflict with the RPO regarding protection of sensitive habitats (wetlands). <u>(Note: This impact is avoided under Reduced Project Alternative I.)</u>	<b>MM 2.2.p</b> No mitigation proposed.	Significant and Umitigable. <u>(Note: This impact is avoided under Reduced Project Alternative I.)</u>
<b>Section 2.3 – Hazards and Hazardous Materials</b>		
<b>Impact 2.3.a</b> Significant soil impacts from the above-ground fuel storage tanks.	<b>MM 2.3.a</b> Removal of the two above-ground fuel storage tanks shall comply with all applicable federal, state and local regulations. Any necessary permits shall be obtained prior to removal and relocation. An amendment to the Business Plan shall be approved prior to relocation of the above-ground storage tanks. An Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) will be performed to test for potential soil contamination from the tanks in the existing maintenance yard. The Salvation Army will follow all recommended remediation measures outlined in the ESA. In addition, the Salvation Army will consult with the Ramona Fire Department prior to relocating the tanks for appropriate approval of the new tank location (pers. comm. Delgadillo, S. Ramona Fire Department, April 2000). The new tank location shall be limited to existing developed areas within the project site. The relocated tanks shall be UL-2085 tanks as required by code.	Not Significant.
<b>Section 2.3 – Hazards and Hazardous Materials (continued)</b>		
<b>Impact 2.3.b</b> Significant hazards and hazardous materials impact due to an increase in the number of people that could be exposed to a wildland fire.	<b>MM 2.3.b</b> <u>The Fire Protection measures and requirements, as identified in the Salvation Army Divisional Camp Fire Protection Plan (FPP) (Dudek, January 2010) shall be implemented.</u>  The following conditions shall be included in the Major Use Permit to mitigate for Hazards and Public Safety impacts related to potential fires in the project area: <del> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Ramona Fire Department determined that a 260,000 gallon water tank at an elevation of approximately 1,665 MSL with a ten inch on site water line that connects to the existing six inch water main in Mussey Grade Road will meet fire flow requirements for the project and will also enhance the flow capacity to</li> </ul> </del>	Not Significant.

Impact(s)	Recommended Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance of Impact(s) After Mitigation
	<p><del>fight future fires in the project area. Prior issuance of building permits, the applicant shall submit to the County, plans approved by the Ramona Municipal Water District Engineering Department for a water system capable of handling the fire flow requirements for the project (existing and proposed buildings).</del></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>• Prior to the issuance of building permits the appropriate number of fire hydrants and their specific locations, approved by the Ramona Fire Department, will be identified and constructed.</del></li> <li><del>• Automatic sprinklers shall be installed in all existing and new buildings, consistent with the Ramona Fire Code Ordinance 99-199. This shall be determined after the water system plans are approved.</del></li> <li><del>• With the exception of the fire access roads designated as "existing access road to remain, road not to be paved," (item #4), and the roads depicted as "existing road width to remain, road to be paved," as shown on the "Fire Marshal Exhibit: Proposed Site Plan," dated 1/15/02, and revised 4/18/02, and 5/1/02 (Appendix H), all other existing fire access roadways, and all new fire access roadways from Mussey Grade Road leading into and within the project shall be improved to a width of a minimum 24 feet of paved surfacing. As illustrated in this exhibit some areas will not be widened to 24 feet in order to avoid impacts to sensitive biological resources.</del></li> <li><del>• A lighted map directory shall be provided at every intersection within the proposed project denoting, with numbers, the areas on site that the particular road leads to.</del></li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>• "No Parking Fire Lane" signs shall be posted on all roads that have the fire department required width of 24 feet. The number of signs and their placement shall be determined by the Ramona Fire Department.</del></li> <li><del>• A fuel modification zone a minimum of 100 feet in width will be provided around the entire perimeter of each building site, as depicted on the site plan, consistent with Ramona Fire Code Ordinance 99-199.</del></li> <li><del>• A ten-foot wide fuel modification zone shall occur along each side of all fire access roadways.</del></li> <li><del>• The following exceptions to the fuel modification requirements above are granted per the Fire Code:</del></li> </ul>	

Impact(s)	Recommended Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance of Impact(s) After Mitigation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>—Single specimens of trees, ornamental shrubbery or similar plants used as ground covers, provided that they do not form a means of rapidly transmitting fire from the native growth to any structure.</del></li> <li><del>—Grass and other vegetation located more than 30 feet from buildings or structures and less than 18 inches (457 mm) in height above the ground need not be removed where necessary to stabilize the soil and prevent erosion.</del></li> <li><del>—With the approval of the FAHJ, the width of the fuel modification zone may be reduced where fire resistive structures or other features are constructed. However, in no case shall the fuel modification zone cannot be reduced to less than 30 feet.</del></li> <li><del>• Prior to issuance of building permits, a fire alarm system shall be provided.</del></li> <li><del>• A response map update in a format compatible with current department mapping shall be provided, as specified in the Ramona Fire Code Ordinance 99-199.</del></li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>• The Salvation Army shall, at all times, have two large capacity school buses with drivers or other equivalent vans or buses on the premises at all times when children are attending camp.</del></li> <li><del>• The Salvation Army shall prepare a fire evacuation/fire drill plan for the camp and conduct a fire drill the first day of every camp period. The plan will establish scheduled drop points for the occupants to facilitate complete evacuation.</del></li> <li><del>• The Ramona Fire Department has agreed to, and shall observe an annual fire evacuation/fire drill exercise to ensure proper safety measures have been implemented. After this annual observation and review, the fire department may require more than two large capacity school buses with drivers to be available at the camp for evacuation purposes. To protect family or adult campers who were transported to the camp by bus or van, the Ramona Fire Department may also require one or more additional buses with drivers to be available to evacuate the campers or may require other protective measures.</del></li> <li><del>• The yurts will have skirting installed in a manner similar to skirting on trailer or mobile homes.</del></li> </ul>	

Impact(s)	Recommended Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance of Impact(s) After Mitigation
<b>Section 2.4 – Noise</b>		
<b>Impact 2.4.a</b> Noise levels from use of construction equipment within 125 feet of the camp property line at the boundary of residential property.	<b>MM 2.4.a</b> All construction activities shall require the use of temporary sound barriers for operations within 125 feet of any project boundary. Such sound barriers shall be a minimum of eight feet in height. The noise level reduction shall be a minimum of five dBA. Barriers shall be located between the source and the property line at a maximum of 40 feet from the source. Where grading activities occur within 40 feet of the property boundary, the grading plans shall include restrictions that limit the grading to a maximum duration of 24 minutes in an hour.	Not Significant.
<b>Impact 2.4.b</b> Noise impacts from the presentation areas to off-site receptors.	<b>MM 2.4.b</b> The use of sound amplifying equipment as defined by the County Code section 36.402 at any outdoor location is prohibited. All indoor activities involving the use of sound amplifying equipment shall comply with the noise limits defined in the County Code section 36.404.	Not Significant.
<b>Impact 2.4.c</b> Noise impacts from on-site air conditioners.	<b>MM 2.4c</b> All residential air conditioning units at the Retreat Center (HP3) shall have a Sound Rating of 7.0 Bels, or less per American Refrigeration Institute (ARI) test procedure. Units designated HP1 shall not exceed a Sound Rating of 9.3 Bels; units designated HP2 shall not exceed a sound rating of 9.5 Bels and units designated CU1 and CU2 shall not exceed a sound rating of 8.9 Bels.	Not Significant.
<b>Impact 2.4.d</b> Noise impacts from the operation of some maintenance equipment north of the Retreat Center and south of the existing landfill.	<b>MM 2.4.d</b> The Salvation Army Procedures Manual shall include the Special Notice identified in Figures 2.4-4a through 2.4-4c. When performing maintenance activities within potential noise violation areas, maintenance shall be restricted to non-motorized tools. Signs, in both English and Spanish, shall be posted at the potential noise violation areas restricting the use of motorized maintenance equipment. A Special Notice, identifying potential noise violation areas and restricting the use of motorized equipment within such areas, shall be discussed with and, provided to any contracted maintenance crews. This notice shall be posted in locations explicitly visible to all maintenance crews.	Not Significant.



Impact(s)	Recommended Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance of Impact(s) After Mitigation
<b>Impact 2.4.e</b> Construction operations may exceed 60 dBA near sensitive avian habitats resulting in significant noise impacts.	<b>MM 2.4.e</b> Construction activities shall be prohibited during the California gnatcatcher 'breeding season (March 1 - July 1) unless nest monitoring is conducted by a qualified biologist and results indicated the absence of active nests or the completion of the breeding season.	Not Significant.
<b>Section 2.5 - Aesthetics</b>		
<b>Impact 2.5.a</b> Aesthetic impact associated with the Retreat Center access road cut and fill slopes <u>under the Applicant's Preferred Project. (Note: this impact would be avoided under the Reduced Project Alternative I as the Retreat Center would be located more centrally on the project site; and, at that location, the cut slopes for the Retreat Center access road would not exceed the County's 15-foot standard).</u>	<b>MM 2.5.a</b> The proposed Retreat Center access road cut and fill slopes shall be contour-graded to integrate with the natural contours of the adjoining topography and revegetated with native vegetation. <u>(Note: This mitigation measure would not be required for Reduced Project Alternative I).</u>	Not Significant.
<b>Section 2.6 – Cultural Resources</b>		
<b>Impact 2.6.a.1</b> Impacts to CA-SDI-15,113.  <b>Impact 2.6.a.2</b> Impacts to CA-SDI-15115.  <b>Impact 2.7.a.3</b> Impacts to CA-SDI-15116.	<b>MM 2.6.a.1 – 2.6.a.3</b> All archaeological materials recovered during the significance testing for sites CA-SDI-15113, CA-SDI-15114, CA-SDI-15115, and CA-SDI-15116 shall be curated according to current professional repository standards. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility within San Diego County, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation.	Not Significant.
<b>Impact 2.6.b</b> Impacts to CA-SDI-15114.	<b>MM 2.6.b</b> Site CA-SDI-15114 is considered significant under CEQA criteria, and mitigation consisting of preservation of the site with a minimum 100-foot (30 m) buffer via a 75 x 55 m (246 x 180 ft.) legally dedicated open space easement shall be created (Confidential Appendix, Figure 7).	Not Significant.

Impact(s)	Recommended Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance of Impact(s) After Mitigation
<b>Section 2.7 – Land Use/Planning</b>		
<b>Impact 2.7.a</b> Conflict with Policy 9 of the General Plan Conservation Element from impacts to sensitive biological habitat. <u>(Note: This impact is avoided under Reduced Project Alternative I.)</u>	<b>MM 2.7.a</b> No mitigation proposed.	Significant and Unmitigable. <u>(Note: This impact is avoided under Reduced Project Alternative I.)</u>
<b>Section 3.1.10 – Transportation/Traffic</b>		
<b>Impact 3.1.10.a</b> Significant cumulative roadway segment impact:s <u>(SR-67 between Archie Moore Road and Mussey Grade Road).</u>  <b>Impact 3.1.10.b</b> Significant cumulative intersection impacts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>SR-67/Archie Moore Road (unsignalized)</u></li> <li><u>SR-67/Mussey Grade Road (unsignalized)</u></li> <li><u>SR-67/Dye Road/Highland Valley Road (Signalized)</u></li> </ul>	<b>MM 3.1.10.a &amp; b</b> <u>Payment of the Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) will mitigate the project's contribution to the cumulative traffic impacts.</u> <del>Construct the following improvements to the SR 67/ Dye Road/ Highland Valley Road intersection:</del> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>i. Provide a second westbound to southbound left turn lane from Dye Road to SR 67, and;</del></li> <li><del>ii. Lengthen the existing northbound to eastbound right turn pocket from SR 67 to Dye Road to provide a 500 foot long pocket.</del></li> </ul> <del>Construct the following improvements to the SR 67/ Mussey Grade Road intersection:</del> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>i. Extend the southbound acceleration lane on SR 67 departing the Mussey Grade Road intersection by 100 feet;</del></li> <li><del>ii. Widen the intersection approach of Mussey Grade Road at SR 67 to allow for a dedicated right turn lane to SR 67 northbound, and;</del></li> <li><del>iii. Widen northbound SR 67 departing the Mussey Grade Road intersection to match the planned extension of the northbound to eastbound right turn pocket at Dye Road, as described above.</del></li> </ul> <del>The County is currently considering a Traffic Impact Fee (TIF) program. The TIF program includes two components, the financing mechanism (i.e., the fee) and a commitment to construct certain road improvements. If the County adopts both components of the TIF program and the TIF program includes the road improvements necessary to mitigate the project's contribution to the cumulative impacts, payment of the TIF will mitigate the project's contribution to the cumulative traffic impacts.</del>	Significant and Mitigable.

*This page intentionally left blank.*